DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 313 666 CS 009 859

AUTHOR Lore, Rosemary; Chamberlain, Ed
TITLE Language Development Component, Secondary Reading Program 1988-89. Final Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Columbus Public Schools, OH. Dept. of Evaluation Services.
PUB DATE Jul 89
NOTE 50p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Skills; Compensatory Education; Computer Assisted Instruction; High Schools; High School Students; Inservice Teacher Education; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Public Schools; Reading Diagnosis; *Reading Difficulties; *Reading Programs; Reading Research; *Reading Skills; *Remedial Programs; Underachievement
IDENTIFIERS *Columbus Public Schools OH

ABSTRACT

Designed to improve underachieving high school students' reading and communication skills, the Secondary Reading Program served 595 ninth, tenth, and eleventh graders in 12 Columbus, Ohio, public schools. Funding was made available through the Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund (DPPF). Thirteen teachers participated in the 1987-88 program, eight of them using computer-assisted instruction (CAI) to teach 402 students, and four of them serving 193 students with regular program instruction. Diagnostic tests assessed students' individual reading strengths and weaknesses. Data analyzed included pretest and posttest scores, and inservice evaluation forms. Specific objectives of the program were (1) that pupils who attended 80% of the 5.7-month training period would show an average of 1.0 Normal Curve Equivalency (NCE) for each month, and (2) that program personnel would be provided at least two inservice sessions and that at least 80% of the personnel attending each session would rate the session as valuable. The first objective was not attained, while the second objective was technically attained but fell short of the intent of the objective. Several recommendations for the 1989-90 school year program include conducting a followup study and restructuring the program. (Eleven tables of data are included, and evaluation forms are appended.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED313666

Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund (DPPF)

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT
SECONDARY READING PROGRAM

July 1989

Written by:

Rosemary Lore and Ed Chamberlain
Professional Specialists

Under the Supervision of:

E. Jane Williams, Ph.D.

Columbus (Ohio) Public Schools
Department of Evaluation Services
Gary Thompson, Ph.D., Director

CS009859

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Gary E. Thompson
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT
SECONDARY READING PROGRAM
1988-89

ABSTRACT

Program Description: The Secondary Reading Program (SRP) served 595 pupils in grades 9-12 in 12 senior high schools. Funding of the component was made available through the Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund (DPPF).

The purpose of the SRP component is to assist underachieving high school pupils in raising their reading and communication skills. Emphasis of the program is placed on literacy survival skills necessary to function in our word-oriented world.

For the 1988-89 school year, within the SRP component, eight teachers in eight senior high schools participated in a project which utilized Apple computers for computer assisted instruction/computer management system (CAI/CMS). The computer software and attendant services were contracted with the Prescription Learning (PL) Company of Springfield, Illinois. The regular treatment project had five teachers in four senior high schools.

Time Interval: For evaluation purposes, the Secondary Reading Program started on October 3, 1988 and continued through April 7, 1989. This interval of time gave 113 possible days of program instruction. Pupils included in the final pretest-posttest analysis must have attended at least 90 days (80%) during the time period stated above.

Activities: The program made use of diagnostic testing to assess pupils' individual reading strengths and weaknesses. Individualized instruction to meet pupils' needs was provided on a daily basis in a small group setting.

Program Objectives: The program had two objectives. Objective 1.1 stated that an evaluation sample will be comprised of pupils who score at or below the 36%ile on a selection test and are in attendance at least 80% of the instructional period. Pupils who attend 80% of the 5.7 month treatment period will show an average gain in reading of 1.0 NCE for each month, which is an average gain of 5.7 NCEs overall (5.7 months x 1.0 NCE). Objective 2.1 stated that program personnel will be provided at least two inservice sessions and that at least 80% of the personnel attending each session will rate the session as valuable in providing information that will assist them in carrying out their program responsibilities.

Evaluation Design: Objective 1.1 was evaluated through the administration of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS) Reading Comprehension subtest. Analyses of the data included comparison of pretest to posttest change scores in terms of grade equivalents, percentiles, and NCEs. Objective 2.1 was evaluated by means of the General Inservice Evaluation Form, a locally constructed instrument.

Major Findings/Recommendations: The information collected on the Pupil Census Forms indicated the program served 595 pupils for an average of 3.6 hours of instruction per week. The average daily membership in the program was 497.8 pupils. The average days of enrollment per pupil was 94.5 days and the average attendance per pupil was 77.5 days. The average number of pupils served per teacher was 38.3.

Objective 1.1, that pupils who attended 80% of the 5.7 month treatment period would show an average gain in reading of 1.0 NCE for each month, was not attained. There was a negative average change of -4.8 or -0.8 NCE per month.

Objective 2.1, that program personnel would be provided at least two inservice sessions and that at least 80% of the personnel attending each session would rate the session as valuable in providing information to assist them in carrying out their program responsibilities, was technically attained, but fell short of the intent of the objective. There was a total of two inservice meetings, but only one of these was available to all program teachers. The second inservice meeting was limited to teachers in the CAI/CMS project. Both meetings were favorably rated by more than 80% of the participants, with an average of 90.9% of the participants rating the inservice sessions as valuable in carrying out component responsibilities.

The CAI/CMS project was located in eight high schools. The computer assisted units served 402 pupils, while the regular treatment project served 193 pupils. Neither the CAI/CMS project group nor the group receiving regular program instruction attained the achievement criterion. The CAI/CMS project had a negative change of -4.0 NCEs in a 5.7 month period, while the regular project had a negative change of -6.2 NCEs.

Process evaluation of SRP-CAI teachers was conducted using an interview instrument and a questionnaire. Teachers assigned low ratings to the following program areas: testing, communication and coordination with classroom teachers, parent involvement, pupil selection, timeliness of evaluation feedback, temperature/ventilation of labs, and storage space. Aspects of the program that were highly rated included class scheduling, materials, and group progress of pupils. The average percent of instruction time that pupils worked at a computer was calculated to be 49.9%.

The following program recommendations were made: (a) make the program an elective course for pupils with selection test scores below the 36th percentile; (b) schedule time for cooperative planning between program and classroom teachers in order to direct program instruction toward content area of pupil's greatest need; (c) review selection procedures, correlation of course content to system's Graded Course of Study, instructional methods, class size, and test content to determine why pupils are not showing desired growth; (d) school administrators and staff should take the responsibility of assuring an optimum testing environment by not scheduling unsuitable activities during testing weeks and adjusting class schedules to accommodate the length of the tests; (e) conditions for the pretest and for the posttest should be comparable to the norming test conditions; (f) conduct a study by giving ninth-grade pupils the standard version of the posttest as well as the customized version in order to determine comparability of resultant test scores; and (g) it is strongly recommended that the program be restructured during the 1989-90 school year and that a new program be in place by the 1990-91 school year.

Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund (DPPF)

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT
SECONDARY READING PROGRAM

July 1989

Program Description

The Secondary Developmental Reading (SDR) program began in the Columbus Public Schools in the fall of 1971 as a component of the Ohio Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund. The 1988-89 version of the SDR program was renamed Secondary Reading Program (SRP) and was located in 12 Columbus senior high school buildings. Thirteen program reading teachers worked in these 12 schools with 595 pupils in grades 9-12 who scored at or below the 36th percentile on a standardized achievement test in reading used for selection purposes.

Within the 1988-89 SRP component, eight teachers in eight senior high schools participated in a project which utilized Apple microcomputers for computer assisted instruction/computer management system (CAI/CMS). The computer software and attendant services were contracted with the Prescription Learning (PL) Company of Springfield, Illinois. In addition to providing a new technique to reading and language instruction, the use of CAI/CMS was intended to enable teachers to serve more pupils than would be possible in the regular SRP project classrooms. The use of CAI/CMS was also intended to be a cost-effective alternative to replacing badly worn conventional equipment. Of the 595 pupils in the SRP component, 402 received computer assisted instruction and 193 received regular SRP instruction.

The purpose of the SRP component was to assist underachieving senior high pupils in raising their reading and communication skills. Emphasis of the program was placed on literacy survival skills necessary to function in our word-oriented world.

Features of the SRP component included the following:

1. Diagnostic testing to assess a pupil's individual reading strengths and weaknesses.
2. Individualized instruction tailored to meet the needs of pupils.
3. Small group instruction.
4. On-going evaluation of pupils to assess their reading needs.
5. Inservice meetings for teachers.

Evaluation Objectives

Objective 1.1 An evaluation sample will be comprised of pupils who score at or below the 36%ile on a selection test and are in attendance at least 80% of the instructional period. The average reading growth of pupils in the evaluation sample of both the regular project of the Secondary Reading Program (SRP) and in the Computer Assisted Instruction/Computer Management System (CAI/CMS) project of SRP will be 1.0 normal curve equivalent (NCE) point for each month of instruction.

The program time period established for evaluation purposes was 113 days beginning October 3, 1988, and ending April 7, 1989. This time period (113 days divided by an average of 20 school days per month) is equal to 5.7 (rounded) possible months of instruction. Analysis of pretest-posttest performance was contingent on pupil attendance for 90 days (80%) of the 113 day period.

Objective 2.1 To provide at least two inservice sessions to program personnel such that at least 80% of the inservice participants will rate each session as valuable in providing information that will assist them in carrying out their program responsibilities.

Evaluation Design

The evaluation design for the SRP component called for the collection of data in three areas.

1. Pupil Census Information

   The Pupil Census Form was developed for the purpose of collecting pupil demographic and participation data in the Secondary Reading Program (SRP). Program teachers maintained the Pupil Census Forms for all pupils throughout the school year or when the pupils left the program. Data collected on the Pupil Census Forms were the number of days the pupil was enrolled in the program, the number of days the pupil was in attendance, and the average number of hours per week the project teacher served the pupil. Other information collected included the pupil's grade and sex, identification of non-English speaking pupils, identification of any pupil who left the SRP component because of qualifying for a special education program, and a question regarding a pupil's progress which required a subjective response from the project teacher. A copy of the Pupil Census Form can be found in the Appendix (page 26).

2. Standardized Achievement Test Information

   The purpose of the administration of the standardized achievement test was to collect pretest-posttest achievement data on all SRP component pupils to determine if Objective 1.1 was achieved. The standard achievement test used was the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills (CTBS), Reading Comprehension (CTB-McGraw Hill, 1981). The CTBS Reading Comprehension tests were administered on September 26-30, 1988, and again on April 10-14, 1989. The form, subtest and test levels of the CTBS used for each grade level are listed below.

Grade	Subtest	Pretest	Posttest
9	Reading Comprehension	Level J Form U	Level J Form V*
10-12	Reading Comprehension	Level J Form U	Level J Form V

*Estimated by administration of customized Form V.

At posttest time, grade nine was administered a customized test which included items yielding criterion-referenced scores in addition to a customized form of the norm-referenced test. The customized tests were developed by Columbus Public Schools personnel in cooperation with CTB/McGraw-Hill to match the Columbus Public Schools Graded Course of Study.

The achievement tests were administered as follows: Pretests for grades 9-12 were administered by program teachers. Posttests for grade 9 were administered as part of Districtwide Testing. Grades 10-12 were not covered by Districtwide Testing, so program teachers administered their own posttests to grades 10-12 pupils. During Districtwide Testing, ninth-grade tests were administered by classroom teachers with program teachers serving as proctors in some classrooms. Pretesting occurred during the week of September 26-30, 1988; posttesting occurred April 10-14, 1989.

3. Inservice Evaluation

The locally developed General Inservice Evaluation Form was designed to obtain teacher perceptions regarding each inservice session. The form was administered to participants at the close of inservice sessions. A modified version of the form was used for the orientation meeting of September 6, 1988, which was attended by both regular project SRP and SRP-CAI project teachers. There was a total of two inservice meetings - one of which was available to both regular and CAI/CMS SRP teachers and one of which was available only to SRP teachers in the CAI/CMS project. The dates and topics of inservice sessions in the 1988-89 school year were as follows:

September 6, 1988	All SRP Teachers (regular and CAI/CMS) Opening Conference
April 17, 1989	SRP-CAI Teachers Prescription Learning Spring Workshop

Participants completed inservice evaluation forms for both of the above meetings. A copy of the General Inservice Evaluation Form and a copy of the modified version used in the orientation meeting are found in the Appendix (pages 29 and 27-8, respectively).

In addition to the types of data specified in the evaluation design, process evaluation data were obtained in the CAI/CMS project by means of on-site teacher interviews and a mailed questionnaire. The interview instrument and the questionnaire are both found in the Appendix (pages 30-33 and page 34). Collection of process evaluation data was completed in March. The interviews elicited teachers' ratings of various aspects of the project and also gathered data on use of instructional time. The questionnaire was used to obtain descriptive data regarding computer equipment in CAI/CMS labs, and to determine

the percent of program time pupils worked at the computer. The full process evaluation reports are on file at the Department of Evaluation Services (Chamberlain and Lore, 1989; Chamberlain, 1989).

Major Findings

Due to the fact that the 1988-89 SRP component contained two treatment projects (regular instruction group and CAI/CMS instruction group), data on enrollment/attendance and achievement testing are reported below in two ways. These data are first presented for the overall program regardless of treatment project. The second presentation compares the two treatment projects in regard to enrollment/attendance data and achievement test data.

In interpreting the pretest-posttest achievement data, the reader should be aware of the pupil selection process. Previous norm-referenced reading achievement data and staff recommendations were used to select and enroll pupils for the SRP component. To be eligible for the program the pupil had to score at or below the 36th percentile on the selection test. Once the eligibility list was established, pupils were selected in order of their test scores with the lowest scoring pupils selected first. Following enrollment, pupils were pretested on the CTBS Reading Comprehension subtest, Level J Form U.

Pupil Census Information

During the 1988-89 school year the SRP component served 595 pupils. Of the 595 pupils, 481 (80.8%) were ninth-graders, 100 (16.8%) were tenth-graders, nine (1.5%) were eleventh-graders, and five pupils (0.8%) were in the twelfth grade. Of the 595 pupils, 322 (54.1%) attended the minimum number of days (90) to meet the 80% attendance criterion level contained in Objective 1.1. This was slightly more than last year's figure of 52.0%. A breakdown by grade level showed that 261 (54.3%) of the ninth-graders, 55 (55.0%) of the tenth-graders, three (33.3%) of the eleventh-graders, and three (60.0%) of the twelfth-graders met the attendance criterion. The average number of days of enrollment and attendance for program pupils was 94.5 and 77.5, respectively, out of a possible 113 program days. The overall attendance rate for the program (total days of attendance divided by total days of enrollment) was 82.0%, as compared to 80.6% last year. However, enrollment and attendance continued to be a problem. Inclusion in the evaluation sample was based on attending 80% of the 113 program days, not the individual pupil attendance rate. Only 54.1% of the pupils served attended 80% of the program days. The average daily membership was 497.8, which was an average of 38.3 pupils per teacher as compared to 45.1 pupils per teacher in last year's program. Table 1 contains the pupil attendance data.

Of the 595 pupils served by the program, teachers rated 196 (32.9%) as making much progress, 213 (35.8%) as making some progress, 103 (17.3%) as making little progress, and 83 (13.9%) as making no progress. This was measured by an item on the Pupil Census Form which required a subjective response from the project teachers regarding their pupils' progress as they exited the SRP component.

The evaluation sample of 279 pupils (46.8% of the pupils served) consisted of those pupils who met three criteria: attended 80% (90) of the 113 program days, received both a pretest and a posttest with the CTBS, and were judged to be English speaking. Of the 279 pupils in the evaluation sample, 222 pupils were in grade 9, 53 pupils were in grade 10, two pupils were in grade 11, and two were in grade 12.

Table 1
Number of Pupils Served; Averages for Days of Enrollment, Days of Attendance, Daily Membership and Hours of Instruction Per Week; and Pupils Attending 80% of Days
Reported by Grade Level
1988-89

Grade	Pupils Served	Girls	Boys	Average Days of Enrollment	Average Days of Attendance	Average Daily Membership	Average Hours of Instruction per Pupil per Week	Pupils Attending 80% of Days
9	481	198	283	95.7	77.7	407.2	3.6	261
10	100	42	58	92.3	78.5	81.7	3.5	55
11	9	3	6	64.9	56.3	5.2	3.5	3
12	5	2	3	84.8	77.0	3.8	3.5	3
Total	595	245	350	94.5	77.5	497.8	3.6	322

Standardized Achievement Test Information

The analyses of pretest-posttest achievement data provided minimums, maximums, averages or medians, and differences for derived scores by grade level. The derived scores used in the analyses were percentiles, grade equivalents, and normal curve equivalents. No raw score data are presented because pupils took a different form of the test at pretest and posttest times.

Table 2 contains pretest-posttest percentile data. The median percentile for the pretest was 24.0 at grade 9, 14.0 at grade 10, 7.0 at grade 11, and 13.0 at grade 12. The median percentile for the posttest was 13.0 at grade 9, 13.0 at grade 10, 23.0 at grade 11, and 18.5 at grade 12. These data indicate that no grade approached a median percentile score of 36 at posttest time. Further analysis of pretest percentile distributions indicated that 67 (30.2%) of the ninth grade pupils in the sample scored above the 36th percentile on the pretest, even though they had previously qualified for the program by scoring below the 36th percentile on a selection test. Of the 53 pupils in the 10th grade evaluation sample, 5 pupils (9.4%) scored above the 36th percentile on the pretest. All pupils in the evaluation sample in grades 11 and 12 scored below the 36th percentile on the pretest. Since the program served mostly ninth grade, the 67 ninth-grade pupils represented 24.0% of the overall evaluation sample of 279 pupils.

Table 3 contains pretest-posttest grade equivalent data. The median grade equivalent score increased from 7.0 to 7.1 at grade 9, increased from 8.3 to 8.5 at grade 10, increased from 6.9 to 9.0 at grade 11, and increased from 8.2 to 9.4 at grade 12.

The presentation of achievement data thus far has included results from the analyses of percentiles and grade equivalents. Both percentiles and grade equivalent scores provide comparative information but are not equal units of measure. Caution is advised in drawing conclusions about program impact from any of the scores above. Normal curve equivalents (NCEs) are generally considered to provide the truest indication of pupil growth in achievement, since they provide comparative information in equal units of measurement. Data for NCEs are presented in Table 4.

Objective 1.1 states that the evaluation sample would be composed of pupils who scored below the 36th percentile on the selection test and were in attendance 80% of the program's treatment period. In order to meet the attendance criterion the pupil had to attend at least 90 days of the 5.7 month (113 days) treatment period. To achieve Objective 1.1 the average growth in reading achievement of pupils in the evaluation sample had to be 1.0 NCE for each month of the treatment period, which is an average of 5.7 NCEs for the 5.7 month treatment period.

The overall NCE change for the program was -4.8 or an average of -0.8 NCE for each of the 5.7 months of the treatment period. This negative change fell considerably short of the expected evaluation criterion of 1.0 NCE gained for every month the pupils were in the program. A negative change of -6.2 NCEs, or -1.1 NCEs per month, occurred in grade 9. In grade 10 there was no change (0.0). In grade 11 there was a positive change of 15.5 NCEs, or 2.7 NCEs per month; and at grade 12 there was a positive change of 4.5 NCEs, or 0.8 NCE per month. However, the reader should note that at grades 11 and 12 there was a total of four pupils. These data should be interpreted with caution.

It should be noted that NCE scores are based on percentiles, which compare the pupil's performance in relation to the general population. No change in NCE

Table 2
Minimum, Maximum, Median, and Standard Deviation
of the Pretest and Posttest Percentiles
Reported by Grade Level
1988-89

Grade	Pupils in Sample	Pretest				Posttest			
		Min.	Max.	Median Percentile	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Median Percentile	Standard Deviation
9	222	5.0	85.0	24.0	16.2	1.0	99.0	13.0	19.2
10	53	1.0	49.0	14.0	12.5	1.0	60.0	13.0	13.5
11	2	4.0	10.0	7.0	4.2	15.0	31.0	23.0	11.3
12	2	9.0	17.0	13.0	5.7	10.0	27.0	18.5	12.0

Table 3
Minimum, Maximum, Median and Standard Deviation
of the Pretest and Posttest Grade Equivalents
Reported by Grade Level
1988-89

Grade	Pupils in Sample	Pretest				Posttest			
		Min.	Max.	Median Grade Equivalents	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Median Grade Equivalent	Standard Deviation
9	222	4.2	12.9	7.0	1.7	4.0	12.9	7.1	2.0
10	53	4.2	10.0	8.3	1.5	4.2	12.4	8.5	1.6
11	2	5.8	8.0	6.9	1.6	8.5	9.5	9.0	0.7
12	2	7.6	8.8	8.2	0.8	9.0	9.8	9.4	0.6

Table 4
Minimum, Maximum, Average, and Standard Deviation of the
Pretest and Posttest Normal Curve Equivalents (NCE)
Reported by Grade Level
1988-89

Grade	Pupils in Sample	Pretest				Posttest				Average NCE Change (Criterion 5.7)
		Min.	Max.	Average NCE	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Average NCE	Standard Deviation	
9	222	15.0	72.0	35.6	11.5	1.0	97.0	29.5	15.4	-6.2
10	53	1.0	49.0	27.3	11.0	1.0	55.0	27.3	11.7	0.0
11	2	14.0	23.0	18.5	6.4	28.0	40.0	34.0	8.5	15.5
12	2	21.0	30.0	25.5	6.4	23.0	37.0	30.0	9.9	4.5
Total	279			33.9				29.1		-4.8

score would indicate that pupils have progressed at their normal rate of growth over the school year. Even a small gain in percentile or NCE score would indicate that pupils have advanced over the school year at a greater rate than would be expected from their original position in relation to the general population. Table 5 contains data related to the changes in NCE scores for three ranges: (a) no improvement in NCE scores (0.0 or less), (b) some improvement in NCE scores (0.1 to 5.6), and (c) substantial improvement in NCE scores (5.7 or more). The data indicate that 101 (36.2%) pupils made gains in NCE scores. This means that 36.2% of the pupils in the evaluation sample progressed at a rate that was greater than normal for them. More specifically, 55 (19.7%) made substantial improvement and 46 (16.5%) made some improvement in NCE scores, while 178 pupils (63.8%) in the evaluation sample made no improvement. In regard to grade level, 72 of 222 (32.4%) ninth-grade pupils showed improvement; 25 of 53 (47.2%) of tenth-grade pupils showed improvement; two of two (100.0%) of eleventh-grade pupils; and two of two (100.0%) of twelfth-grade pupils demonstrated improvement.

Tables 6-10 present overall comparisons as well as grade comparisons between the group of pupils receiving computer assisted instruction/computer management system (CAI/CMS) in reading and the group receiving the regular program instruction. As indicated in Table 6, there were 402 pupils served by the CAI/CMS project and 193 pupils who received regular reading instruction. The CAI/CMS project averaged 1.7 more days of attendance per pupil with an overall average of 78.1 days as compared to 76.4 days for the regular project. In the CAI/CMS project 217 of the 402 pupils served (54.0%) met the program attendance criterion by attending at least 90 days. In the regular treatment project the attendance criterion was met by 105 (54.4%) of the 193 pupils served. The evaluation sample of 279 pupils was comprised of 180 pupils in the CAI/CMS project and 99 pupils in the regular project. Achievement data for the two subpopulations of the program are presented in Tables 7-10.

Percentile score grade comparisons can be made only for grades 9 and 10 because the regular project did not serve grades 11 and 12. These comparisons are presented in Table 7. In grade 9 the median percentile score regressed from 24.0 to 13.5 in the CAI/CMS project and from 27.0 to 11.5 in the regular treatment project. At grade 10 the median percentile regressed from 14.0 to 13.0 in the CAI/CMS treatment group but progressed from 11.0 to 16.0 in the regular treatment group.

Table 8 presents grade 9 and grade 10 comparisons in terms of median grade equivalent scores. Changes in median grade equivalent scores were small in the CAI/CMS project and in grade 10 of the regular project. Negative change occurred in grade 9 of the regular project. The median grade equivalent score increased from 7.0 to 7.3 in grade 9 of the CAI/CMS project and decreased from 7.6 to 6.8 in grade 9 of the regular project. The median grade equivalent score increased from 8.3 to 8.5 in the CAI/CMS tenth-grade group and increased from 7.6 to 8.7 in the regular tenth-grade group. In grade 10 the overall sample was smaller (53 pupils, 19.0%), while grade 9 comprised the bulk of the pupils (222 pupils, 79.6%) of the total sample of 279 pupils in grades 9-12. These data should be interpreted with caution due to small sample size at grade 10.

As indicated earlier, NCE scores are generally considered to provide the most comparative information in equal units of measurement. Data for the two projects in terms of NCE scores are presented in Table 9. Grade comparisons can only be made at grades 9 and 10 because the regular project did not serve grades 11 and 12. The data indicate that the average NCE change within the CAI/CMS project was -5.2 NCE points in grade 9, with 142 pupils in the sample, and -0.5 NCE point in grade 10, with 34 pupils in the sample. In the regular

Table 5
Change Categories for NCE Scores
for Total SRP Component
1988-89

Grade	Pupils in Sample	Change Categories		
		No Improvement (0.0 or less)	Some Improvement (0.1 to 5.6)	Substantial Improvement (5.7 or more)
Grade 9				
Number of Pupils	222	150	34	38
% of Pupils		67.6%	15.3%	17.1%
Grade 10				
Number of Pupils	53	28	11	14
% of Pupils		52.8%	20.8%	26.4%
Grade 11				
Number of Pupils	2	0	0	2
% of Pupils		0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Grade 12				
Number of Pupils	2	0	1	1
% of Pupils		0.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Total				
Number of Pupils	279	178	46	55
% of Pupils		63.8%	16.5%	19.7%

EVALSRVCS/P510/RPTFSRP89
10/27/89

Table 6
Number of Pupils Served, Averages for Days of Enrollment, Days of Attendance, Daily Membership and Hours of Instruction Per Week, and Pupils Attending 80% of Days Reported by Grade Level for Pupils Receiving Reading Instruction with Computers (CAI/CMS Group) and Pupils Receiving Reading Instruction without Computers (Regular Group)
1988-89

Grade	Pupils Served	Girls	Boys	Average Days of Enrollment	Average Days of Attendance	Average Daily Membership	Average Hrs. of Inst. Per Pupil Per Week	Pupils Attending 80% of Days
CAI/CMS Group								
9	321	136	185	96.1	78.8	273.1	3.6	177
10	67	29	38	91.6	77.7	54.3	3.6	34
11	9	3	6	64.9	56.3	5.2	3.5	3
12	5	2	3	84.8	77.0	3.8	3.5	3
Total	402	170	232	94.5	78.1	336.3	3.6	217
Regular Group								
9	160	62	98	94.7	75.6	134.1	3.6	84
10	33	13	20	93.8	80.2	27.4	3.5	21
Total	193	75	118	94.5	76.4	161.4	3.6	105

Table 7
Minimum, Maximum, Median, and Standard Deviation
of the Pretest and Posttest Percentiles Reported by Grade Level
for Pupils Receiving Reading Instruction with Computers (CAI/CMS Group)
and Pupils Receiving Reading Instruction without Computers (Regular Group)
1988-89

Grade	Pupils in Sample	Pretest				Posttest			
		Min.	Max.	Median Percentile	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Median Percentile	Standard Deviation
CAI/CMS Group									
9	142	5.0	68.0	24.0	15.2	1.0	99.0	13.5	18.5
10	34	1.0	44.0	14.0	12.7	1.0	60.0	13.0	14.3
11	2	4.0	10.0	7.0	4.2	15.0	31.0	23.0	11.3
12	2	9.0	17.0	13.0	5.7	10.0	27.0	18.5	12.0
Regular Group									
9	80	5.0	85.0	27.0	17.9	1.0	94.0	11.5	20.6
10	19	3.0	49.0	11.0	12.2	1.0	49.0	16.0	12.3

Table 8
Minimum, Maximum, Median, and Standard Deviation
of the Pretest and Posttest Grade Equivalents Reported by Grade Level
for Pupils Receiving Reading Instruction with Computers (CAI/CMS Group)
and Pupils Receiving Reading Instruction without Computers (Regular Group)
1988-89

Grade	Pupils in Sample	Pretest				Posttest			
		Min.	Max.	Median Grade Equivalents	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Median Grade Equivalent	Standard Deviation
CAI/CMS Group									
9	142	4.2	10.4	7.0	1.6	4.0	12.9	7.3	1.9
10	34	4.2	9.7	8.3	1.5	4.2	12.4	8.5	1.7
11	2	5.8	8.0	6.9	1.6	8.5	9.5	9.0	0.7
12	2	7.6	8.8	8.2	0.8	9.0	9.8	9.4	0.6
Regular Group									
9	80	4.2	12.9	7.6	1.9	4.0	12.9	6.8	2.1
10	19	5.1	10.0	7.6	1.6	4.2	10.7	8.7	1.6

Table 9
Minimum, Maximum, Average, and Standard Deviation of the
Pretest and Posttest Normal Curve Equivalents (NCE) Reported by Grade Level
for Pupils Receiving Reading Instruction with Computers (CAI/CMS Group)
and Pupils Receiving Reading Instruction without Computers (Regular Group)
1988-89

Grade	Pupils in Sample	Pretest				Posttest				Average NCE Change (Criterion 5.7)
		Min.	Max.	Average NCE	Standard Deviation	Min.	Max.	Average NCE	Standard Deviation	
CAI/CMS Group										
9	142	15.0	60.0	35.1	10.8	1.0	97.0	29.9	15.1	-5.2
10	34	1.0	46.0	28.2	11.1	1.0	55.0	27.7	12.1	-0.5
11	2	14.0	23.0	18.5	6.4	28.0	40.0	34.0	8.5	15.5
12	2	21.0	30.0	25.5	6.4	23.0	37.0	30.0	9.9	4.5
Total	180			33.5				29.5		-4.0
Regular Group										
9	80	15.0	72.0	36.5	12.7	1.0	83.0	28.7	16.0	-7.9
10	19	11.0	49.0	25.6	10.8	1.0	49.0	26.6	11.4	1.0
Total	99			34.4				28.3		-6.2

Table 10
Change Categories for NCE Scores for Total SRP Program Reported by
Grade Level for Pupils Receiving Reading Instruction with Computers
(CAI/CMS Group) and Pupils Receiving Reading Instruction
without Computers (Regular Group)
1988-89

Grade	Pupils in Sample	Change Categories: No Improvement (0.0 or less)	Some Improvement (0.1 to 5.6)	Substantial Improvement (5.7 or more)
CAI/CMS Group				
Grade 9				
Number of Pupils	142	93	25	24
% of Pupils		65.5%	17.6%	16.9%
Grade 10				
Number of Pupils	34	18	6	10
% of Pupils		52.9%	17.6%	29.4%
Grade 11				
Number of Pupils	2	0	0	2
% of Pupils		0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Grade 12				
Number of Pupils	2	0	1	1
% of Pupils		0.0%	50.0%	50.0%
Total				
Number of Pupils	180	111	32	37
% of Pupils		61.7%	17.8%	20.6%

(Table Continued)

Table 10 (Continued)
Change Categories for NCE Scores for Total SRP Program Reported by
Grade Level for Pupils Receiving Reading Instruction with Computers
(CAI/CMS Group) and Pupils Receiving Reading Instruction
without Computers (Regular Group)
1988-89

Grade	Pupils in Sample	Change Categories		
		No Improvement (0.0 or less)	Some Improvement (0.1 to 5.6)	Substantial Improvement (5.7 or more)
Regular Group				
Grade 9				
Number of Pupils	80	57	9	14
% of Pupils		71.3%	11.3%	17.5%
Grade 10				
Number of Pupils	19	10	5	4
% of Pupils		52.6%	26.3%	21.1%
Total				
Number of Pupils	99	67	14	18
% of Pupils		67.7%	14.1%	18.2%

treatment project the 80 pupils in grade 9 had an average negative change of -7.9 NCE points, and the sample of 19 pupils in grade 10 had an average positive change of 1.0 NCE point. Neither SRP project met the criterion of Objective 1.1 with a change of 5.7 NCE points, or 1.0 NCE points for each month of instruction. An overall comparison of the two treatment projects is obtained by examining the average NCE changes across grade levels (grades 9-12). The average change for the CAI/CMS project was -4.0 NCE points over the 5.7 month treatment period. The regular treatment project regressed even more with an average change of -6.2 NCE points in the same 5.7 month treatment period.

Table 10 compares the overall CAI/CMS and regular projects in regard to numbers and percents of pupils who evidenced no improvement, some improvement, and substantial improvement, as previously defined. The data indicate that 69 pupils (38.3%) of the CAI/CMS project made positive gains in NCE scores, while 32 pupils (32.3%) of the regular project did so. Positive gains in the CAI/CMS project included 37 pupils (20.6%) who made substantial improvement and 32 pupils (17.8%) who made some improvement. Positive gains in the regular project included 18 pupils (18.2%) making substantial improvement, and 14 pupils (14.1%) making some improvement.

Inservice Evaluation Information

Objective 2.1 stated that program personnel would be provided at least two inservice sessions and that at least 80% of the personnel attending each session would rate the session as valuable in providing information that would assist them in carrying out their program responsibilities. A total of two inservice meetings was provided by the Department of Federal and State Programs. All SRP teachers were given the opportunity to attend the opening conference of September 6, 1988. The second inservice meeting was the Prescription Learning spring workshop of April 17, 1989, which was specific to the CAI/CMS portion of the program only. A modified version of the General Inservice Evaluation Form was used for the opening conference while the other inservice meeting was assessed using the regular General Inservice Evaluation Form. Copies of these two instruments are in the Appendix (pages 27-29).

The 80% criterion was attained in both inservice meetings with 83.3% of the participants in the first meeting, and 100.0% in the second meeting, either agreeing or strongly agreeing that the meetings were valuable in assisting them in their programs.

Table 11 contains a summary of the combined teacher ratings for all of the inservice programs. In this combined rating, 90.0% of the participants agreed or strongly agreed that the information in the meetings would assist them in their program. Ratings were based on the following five-point scale:

5 = Strongly Agree (SA) 3 = Undecided (U) 2 = Disagree (D)
4 = Agree (A) 1 = Strongly Disagree (SD)

Table 11
Average Response and Percent of Response
For Reactions to Inservice Statements

Statements	Number Responding	Average Response	Percent SA (5)	A (4)	U (3)	D (2)	SD (1)
1. I think this was a very worthwhile meeting.	20	4.4	60.0	30.0	0.0	10.0	0.0
2. The information presented in the meeting will assist me in my program.	20	4.3	50.0	40.0	0.0	10.0	0.0
3. There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentation.	20	4.5	55.0	40.0	0.0	5.0	0.0
4. Questions were answered adequately.	20	4.4	50.0	45.0	0.0	5.0	0.0

Open-ended comments on the General Inservice Evaluation Form asked participants to comment about the most and least valuable parts of the meetings and about information they would like to have covered in future meetings. Only those open-ended comments which were made by three or more participants at any single session will be summarized here. However, the evaluation reports on individual sessions have been forwarded to the Department of State and Federal Programs and are available on request from the Department of Evaluation Services.

In regard to the most valuable parts of the inservice meetings, three items had a frequency of three or more at a given meeting: a session with Mr. Hilliard at the opening conference, discussion with Mr. Hilliard at the spring workshop, and new programs and materials presented at the spring workshop. For the question dealing with the least valuable part, none of the participants' responses had a frequency of three or more at a meeting. There were no suggestions for future meetings having a frequency of three or more at a meeting.

It is concluded that Objective 2.1 technically was attained, but fell short of the intent of the objective. There was a total of two inservice meetings, both of which were rated as valuable in carrying out component responsibilities by more than the requisite 80% of the participants. However, participation in the second meeting was limited to teachers in the CAI/CMS portion of the program. Regular project SRP teachers had only one inservice meeting available to them.

Process Evaluation Information

In addition to the types of data specified in the evaluation design, process evaluation data were obtained in the CAI/CMS project by means of on-site teacher interviews and a mailed questionnaire. The interview instrument and the questionnaire are both found in the Appendix (pages 30-33, and page 34, respectively). The full process evaluation reports are on file at the Department of Evaluation Services. Collection of both types of process evaluation data was completed in March.

On-site visitations and teacher interviews were conducted by a program evaluator in March 1989 in all eight of the SRP-CAI labs. The interviews were based on a locally constructed instrument, the Evaluator's Interview Log. The interview instrument consisted of 30 items using a five-point rating scale and a final item involving time spent on various instructional activities. Rating scale items were grouped by area of concern. Average ratings were dichotomized as high (4.0 or higher) and low (less than 4.0).

Ratings indicated problems in the following areas: communication and coordination with classroom teachers, parental response to parent involvement efforts, pupil selection, testing, timeliness and usefulness of evaluation feedback, temperature/ventilation in the labs, and storage facilities.

The area of class scheduling received high average ratings, as did materials. Facilities received high average ratings except in the aspects of temperature/ventilation and storage space. The DFSP Student Data Sheet was rated highly, but comments by teachers indicated a tendency to use alternative methods of keeping pupil records at the high school level. Teachers gave high ratings to group progress of pupils.

In addition to the rating scale items the instrument addressed the percent of instructional time devoted to various types of activities. Computer activities accounted for the largest single activity category (30.5%). The largest non-computer activity was sustained silent reading, at 15.1%. Other activities using 10% or more of instructional time were individual seatwork (12.9%) and small group discussion (10.1%).

Open-ended comments from program teachers were also recorded. Some of the specific concerns expressed were the following: poor testing environment during the posttest, when test is given as part of Districtwide testing; having to fit test administration into an inflexible 43-minute period at the high school level; delays in getting ordered materials; and delays in getting work-orders filled.

The second process evaluation instrument, a questionnaire informally referred to as a computer census form, was mailed to all eight SRP-CAI teachers in February 1989 and collection was completed in March. The instrument had two purposes: to obtain descriptive data regarding computer equipment in CAI/CMS labs, and to determine the percent of program time pupils worked at the computers. All eight CAI/CMS labs in the SRP component were serviced by Prescription Learning (PL). High school PL labs consisted of nine Apple microcomputers used as pupil stations, plus a tenth Apple which was used as the in-lab management system and for pupil hands-on testing. Data from the survey indicated that the average percent of program time a pupil worked at a computer in this project was 49.9%.

The reader will note that there was a discrepancy in the percent of time pupils work with computers as measured by the Evaluator's Interview Log (38.5%) and the computer census form (49.9%). The percent derived from the computer census form is probably the more accurate because it was computed directly from average minutes per week at the computer compared to average minutes per week in the program, with no further variables to consider. The Evaluator's Interview Log, on the other hand, asked teachers to compute percent of instructional time for 14 activities, which in practice could have overlapped and intertwined.

Although a formal process evaluation was not done in the regular project, informal comments by project teachers during the school year reprised the perennial concern over the proctoring of the posttest at the ninth-grade level.

Summary

The Secondary Reading Program is an individualized learning program designed to assist secondary pupils who are having reading problems. During the 1988-89 school year, 13 program teachers working in 12 senior high schools served a total of 595 pupils in grades 9-12.

The program had two objectives. Objective 1.1 stated that pupils who attended 80% of the 5.7 month treatment period would show an average gain in reading of 1.0 NCE for each month, which is an average gain of 5.7 NCEs overall (5.7 months x 1.0 NCE). This objective was not attained. The program showed an overall negative change of -4.8 NCE points for the 5.7 month treatment period, or -0.8 NCE per month. In grade 9 (N=222), the NCE change was -6.2 NCEs for the treatment period, or -1.1 NCE per month; the change in grade 10 (N=53) was 0.0 NCE for the treatment period, or 0.0 NCE per month; in grade 11, the change was 15.5 NCEs, or 2.7 NCEs per month (N=2); and in grade 12 (N=2) the NCE change was 4.5, or 0.8 NCE per month.

Teacher perceptions of pupil progress, as measured by an item on the Pupil Census Form, suggested that they felt there was more pupil progress than test scores indicated. Of the 595 pupils served by the program, teachers rated 196 (32.9%) as making much progress, 213 (35.8%) as making some progress, 103 (17.3%) as making little progress, and 83 (13.9%) as making no progress.

Objective 2.1 stated that program personnel would be provided at least two inservice meetings and that at least 80% of the personnel attending each meeting would rate the meeting as valuable in providing information that would assist them in carrying out their program responsibilities. There was a total of two inservice meetings provided by the Department of Federal and State Programs. One of these was available to both regular project and CAI/CMS project teachers, while the other was available only to CAI/CMS teachers. Both meetings were rated as valuable in carrying out program responsibilities by more than the requisite 80% of participants. Objective 2.1 was technically attained, but did not benefit all program teachers equally.

The CAI/CMS project was located in eight high schools. The computer assisted units served 402 pupils, while 193 pupils were served in the regular project. Neither the CAI/CMS project group nor the group receiving regular program instruction attained the achievement criterion. The CAI/CMS project had a negative change of -4.0 NCEs in a 5.7 month period, while the regular project had a negative change of -6.2 NCEs.

Data obtained from a questionnaire sent to CAI/CMS teachers revealed that all eight labs in the CAI/CMS project were serviced by Prescription Learning (PL). Each lab was equipped with 10 Apple microcomputers, one of which served as the in-lab management system and the hands-on testing station. On the average, project pupils worked 49.9% of program time at a computer.

Process evaluation was conducted by on-site interviews with teachers in the CAI/CMS project. The interviews indicated problems in the following areas: communication and coordination with classroom teachers, parent involvement, pupil selection, timeliness of evaluation feedback, temperature/ventilation in the labs and storage space. Another area of concern to the teachers was testing. Teachers cited poor testing environment in the posttest, which is regularly done as part of Districtwide Testing, and having to fit testing into a 43-minute period as specific shortcomings in the testing process. Aspects of the program which were rated highly by the teachers included class scheduling,

materials, and facilities (with the exception of temperature/ventilation and storage). Teachers also give a high rating to the group progress of their pupils.

During the 1988-89 school year, the Secondary Reading Program experienced problems in several areas.

1. Pupil achievement: In terms of NCE scores, 63.8% of the pupils in the sample showed no improvement; 16.5% showed some improvement but did not attain the achievement criterion of 1.0 NCE per month; and 19.7% met the achievement criterion.

2. Pupil attendance: The average pupil was enrolled in the program 94.5 days out of a possible 113 days and attended only 77.5 days. The overall attendance rate (total days of pupil attendance divided by total days of pupil enrollment) was 82.0%, which averages out to an absence rate of 0.9 day per week. Part of the problem appears to be that the average pupil was not enrolled in the program long enough to meet the requisite number of days of attendance (90 days) to attain the attendance criterion.

3. Testing Concerns: Comments made by teachers to program evaluators indicated continuing concern over certain aspects of some testing situations: inappropriate scheduling of activities during test week, inconsistent application of testing guidelines, and the cavalier attitude of some proctors.

Recommendations

Since the Secondary Reading Program is to be continued for the 1989-90 school year, consideration should be given to the following:

1. The program should become an elective course for those pupils who scored at or below the 36th percentile on a selection test. All eligible pupils should be approached and made aware of the program opportunity. Pupils would receive one-half credit for the year contingent on their fulfillment of a signed contract to attend 80% of the program days, and upon the program teacher's judgment of pupil effort.

2. Coordination of program instruction with classroom instruction should be facilitated by time for communication between program and classroom teachers at regularly scheduled meeting times. Also DFSP personnel need to work with school administrators to see that this is occurring. Program instruction should be directed toward success in the content area where the pupil needs the most help.

3. Review selection procedures, correlation of course content to system's Graded Course of Study, instructional methods, class size, and test content to determine why pupils are not showing desired growth.

4. School administrators and staff should take the responsibility of assuring an optimum testing environment by not scheduling unsuitable activities during testing weeks and by adjusting class schedules to accommodate the length of the tests.

5. Conditions for the pretest and for the posttest should be comparable to the norming test conditions. All proctors should be trained to give the tests per instructions in the Examiners' Manuals. Pupils should not be tested in groups larger than recommended by the test publisher. The importance of proper test administration, purposes, and process should be impressed upon proctors.

6. A study should be made to assess the comparability between the standard and customized versions of the ninth-grade test. The study could be conducted as part of Districtwide Testing, using a representative sample of the district's ninth grade population.

7. For the past eight years, the SRP component has not approached the specified reading achievement results set for the program. During these years the final evaluation reports have recommended a thorough review of many aspects of the program. In addition, the report of the Compensatory Education Programs Study Committee recommended that the current program should be suspended and restructured with consideration given to providing the program at tenth grade as a reading/writing lab. During the 1987-88 school year program teachers were brought in to an all-day meeting to discuss ways to improve the program. In light of these factors, it is strongly recommended that the program be restructured during the 1989-90 school year and that a new program be in place by the 1990-91 school year. This program should begin to reflect implementation of the many recommendations repeatedly made for the program by many people and should address minimum state standards and DPPF program guidelines.

References

CTB/McGraw-Hill Staffwriters. (1981). Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills. Monterey, California: CTB/McGraw-Hill.

Chamberlain, E. (1989). Distribution of different computer systems in Chapter 1 and DPPF program labs using computer assisted instruction. Interim Evaluation Report. Columbus, Ohio: Columbus Public Schools, Department of Evaluation Services.

Chamberlain, E. & Lore, R. (1989). Process evaluation data from teacher interviews in CLEAR-Middle, CLEAR-Middle-CAI, and SRP-CAI programs. Process Evaluation Report. Columbus, Ohio: Columbus Public Schools, Department of Evaluation Services.

Appendix

COLUMBUS PUBLIC SCHOOLS - Columbus, Ohio **PUPIL CENSUS FORM**

LAST NAME | FIRST NAME | M I | SEX | TEACHER NUMBER

SCHOOL | M R | GRADE

USE A NUMBER 2 PENCIL. ERASE COMPLETELY WHEN MAKING CORRECTIONS.

WAS THIS A "NON-ENGLISH SPEAKING" STUDENT?

YES NO

DID THIS PUPIL BECOME QUALIFIED FOR A SPECIAL ED. PROGRAM?

YES NO

HOW DID YOU FEEL THIS PUPIL PROGRESSED WHILE IN YOUR PROGRAM?

MUCH PROGRESS SOME PROGRESS LITTLE PROGRESS NO PROGRESS

TEACHER NUMBER

PROGRAM CODE

STUDENT

SCHOOL

GRADE

SEX

MALE

FEMALE

TOTAL DAYS OF PROGRAM ENROLLMENT 1 2 3

TOTAL DAYS OF PROGRAM ATTENDANCE 4 5 6

HOURS OF INSTRUCTION PER WEEK

NCS Trans-Optic 08 8153 32

41

42

26

ECIA CHAPTER 1 AND DPPF
ORIENTATION INSERVICE EVALUATION FORM
September 6, 1988

Circle only the program(s) you are in:

ECIA Chapter 1 Programs:
(1) ADK
(2) CLEAR-Reading Recovery
(3) CLEAR-Elementary (1-5)
(4) CLEAR-Elementary-CAI
(5) CLEAR-Middle (6-8)
(6) CLEAR-Middle-CAI
(7) MIC-Elementary-CAI
(8) MIC-Middle-CAI
(9) Math-Pilot (3-8)

DPPF Programs:
(10) Secondary Reading (Regular)
(11) Secondary Reading (CAI)
(12) HSCA

Other (Specify)
(13) _____

Circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree with statements 1-4, in rating the overall day of inservice.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I think this was a very worthwhile inservice.	5	4	3	2	1
2. The information presented in this inservice will assist me in my program.	5	4	3	2	1
3. There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentations.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Questions were answered adequately.	5	4	3	2	1

Circle the number that indicates how you would rate each of the following portions of today's inservice in regard to interest and usefulness of presentations.

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
5. Large Group Session					
a. Interest	5	4	3	2	1
b. Usefulness	5	4	3	2	1

****
*
* Please turn over for questions 6-12 *
*
****

EVALSRVCS/CHAPTER 1/ORIEN88

	Superior	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
6. Commercial Exhibits					
a. Interest	5	4	3	2	1
b. Usefulness	5	4	3	2	1
7. Mini-session with Main Speaker					
a. Interest	5	4	3	2	1
b. Usefulness	5	4	3	2	1
8. Program Coordinators' Mini-session					
a. Interest	5	4	3	2	1
b. Usefulness	5	4	3	2	1
c. Clarity of instructions	5	4	3	2	1
9. Evaluation Presentation					
a. Interest	5	4	3	2	1
b. Usefulness	5	4	3	2	1
c. Clarity of instructions	5	4	3	2	1

10. What was the most valuable part of this meeting?_____

_____

11. What was the least valuable part of this meeting?_____

_____

12. What additional information or topics would you like to see covered in future meetings?

_____

_____

_____

GENERAL INSERVICE EVALUATION FORM
1988-89

Inservice Topic: _____

Presenter(s): _____

Date: ____/____/____ (e.g., 03/05/89)
MM DD YY

Session (Check only one): _____ all day _____a.m. _____ p.m.

Circle only the program(s) you are in:

ECIA Chapter 1 Programs:
(1) ADK
(2) CLEAR-Reading Recovery
(3) CLEAR-Primary (Special Treatment)
(4) CLEAR-Elementary-Regular (1-5)
(5) CLEAR-Elementary-CAI
(6) CLEAR-Middle-Regular (6-8)
(7) CLEAR-Middle-CAI
(8) MIC-Elementary-CAI
(9) MIC-Middle-CAI
(10) MIC-Elementary-Pilot (3-5)
(11) MIC-Middle-Pilot (6-8)

DPPF Programs:
(12) Secondary Reading Program (Regular)
(13) Secondary Reading Program (CAI)
(14) HSCA

Other (Specify)
(15)_____

Circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with statements 1-4.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I think this was a very worthwhile meeting.	5	4	3	2	1
2. The information presented in this meeting will assist me in my program.	5	4	3	2	1
3. There was time to ask questions pertaining to the presentation.	5	4	3	2	1
4. Questions were answered adequately.	5	4	3	2	1

5. What was the most valuable part of this meeting?_____

_____

6. What was the least valuable part of this meeting?_____

_____

7. Please list any additional information or topics you would like to see covered in future meetings._____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

Columbus Public Schools

DPPF-SRP and ECIA Chapter 1 Programs

EVALUATOR'S INTERVIEW LOG

___	CLEAR-Elem (1-5)
___	CLEAR-Mid (6-8)
___	DPPF-SRP (9-10)

School _____ Date _____

Program Teacher _____ Evaluator _____

Record Keeping

	Adequate				Inadequate
1. DFSP Student Data Sheet	5	4	3	2	1

General Comments about Record Keeping

_____

_____

_____

Pupil Progress

	Much				None
2. Group Progress	5	4	3	2	1

General Comments about Pupil Progress

_____

_____

_____

Communication with Classroom Teacher

	Very Frequent				Very Infrequent
3. Frequency	5	4	3	2	1

General Comments about Communication with Classroom Teacher _____

_____

_____

EVALSRVCS/P510/LOGSRP89
01/24/89

Coordination with Classroom Teacher

	Always				Never
4. Share Progress of Pupils	5	4	3	2	1
	Always				Never
5. Joint Planning	5	4	3	2	1

General Comments about Coordination with Classroom Teacher_____

_____

_____

Parent Involvement

	Large				Small
6. Response to Efforts to Involve	5	4	3	2	1

General Comments about Parent Involvement

_____

_____

_____

Selection of Pupils

	None				Many
7. Problems	5	4	3	2	1
	Good				Poor
8. Selection Test Choice	5	4	3	2	1
	Simple				Complex
9. Procedures	5	4	3	2	1
	Reasonable				Unreasonable
10. Time Required	5	4	3	2	1

General Comments about Selection of Pupils

_____

_____

_____

Class Scheduling

	Good				Poor
11. Administrative Cooperation	5	4	3	2	1
12. Teacher Cooperation	5	4	3	2	1
13. Class Size	5	4	3	2	1

General Comments about Class Scheduling

_____

_____

_____

Testing

14. Choice of Test	Good	5	4	3	2	Poor 1
15. Problems	None	5	4	3	2	Many 1
16 Procedures	Simple	5	4	3	2	Complex 1
17. Test Scheduling	Easy	5	4	3	2	Difficult 1
18. Time Required	Reasonable	5	4	3	2	Unreasonable 1

General Comments about Testing_____

_____

_____

Evaluation Feedback

19. Amount	Much	5	4	3	2	None 1
20. Information	Useful	5	4	3	2	Useless 1
21 Time Factor	Timely	5	4	3	2	Untimely 1

General Comments about Evaluation Feedback

_____

_____

_____

Materials

22. Amount	Adequate	5	4	3	2	Inadequate 1
23. Levels	Appropriate	5	4	3	2	Inappropriate 1
24. Condition	New	5	4	3	2	Old 1

General Comments about Materials _____

_____

_____

_____

Facilities

		Good				Poor
25.	Space	5	4	3	2	1
26.	Light	5	4	3	2	1
27.	Temperature/Ventilation	5	4	3	2	1
28.	Noise Level	5	4	3	2	1
29.	Furniture	5	4	3	2	1
30.	Storage	5	4	3	2	1

General Comments about Facilities _____

_____

_____

Activities in Lab

31. Percent of Student Time Spent in the Following Activities:

a.	Sustained Silent Reading	_____%
b.	Listening to a Lecture or a Story	_____%
c.	Listening to a Lecture and then Discussing	_____%
d.	Role Playing	_____%
e.	Participating in a Small Group Discussion	_____%
f.	Working at Learning Centers	_____%
g.	Giving Individual Student Reports or Reading Aloud	_____%
h.	Watching Demonstrations or Doing Experiments	_____%
i.	Debating	_____%
j.	Participating in a Play or Skit	_____%
k.	Doing Individual Seatwork	_____%
l.	Test Taking	_____%
m.	Doing Computer Activities	_____%
n.	Other	_____%
	Total Student Time	100%

MEMO

TO: CLEAR, MIC, and SRP Teachers Using Computer-Assisted Instruction (CAI)

FROM: Ed Chamberlain (CLEAR-CAI and SRP-CAI evaluations)
Phyl Thomas (MIC-CAI evaluations)

SUBJECT: Computer Systems Used in CAI Classrooms

DATE: February 15, 1989

Since there is a variety of different computer systems used in program classrooms, it is necessary for us to periodically assess the distribution and use of these computer systems. Please take a few minutes to complete the form below, fold and staple with the return mailing label showing, and return it in the school mail no later than February 28, 1989.

Teacher _____ School _____

1. Please give the number of Computers or Terminals in your lab, by Type

___Apple
___TRS-80
___Microhost
___Sperry
___Dolphin
___PET
___Other _____

2. Please check the company servicing the computers

___Prescription Learning
___B&B
___CCC
___Wasatch
___Houghton-Mifflin
___None
___Other _____

3. Does your computer system include a command module/teacher management system? ___Yes ___No

4. How many computers (or terminals) are available in your lab for student work (do not include the Command Module)? _____

5. The average number of minutes per week a pupil is served in the program

_____ (Reading program pupils) _____ (Math program pupils)

6. The average number of minutes per week a pupil works at a computer

_____ (Reading program pupil) _____ (Math program pupil)

7. Additional comments: _____

_____

cc: Dick Amorose
Rose Carbol
John Hilliard
Pat Huggard
Dick Snide
Jane Williams
Dorothy Wilson